



Housing Town Hall Findings

More than 150 residents, elected officials, housing developers and advocates came together in five separate Housing Town Halls this fall, co-sponsored by Ensuring Opportunity and the Multi-Faith ACTION Coalition, to discuss the impact of the affordable housing crisis in Contra Costa and explore possible solutions.

Participants submitted their ideas on housing solutions that fit the needs of their community. Below is a summary of the most urgent housing needs, barriers to meeting local housing needs, and solutions they would like to see happen. We analyzed common themes seen countywide (across regions), as well as specific differences among the regions.

Countywide – shared priorities:

- The **three most urgent housing needs** were identified as:
 - Long-term housing with services (i.e. to support residents with mental health and substance use needs)
 - More affordable housing options for low-income residents
 - Tenant protections (including rent control)
- The **top three barriers** getting in the way of local housing needs being met were:
 - NIMBYism (Not In My Back Yard) attitudes
 - A lack of funding dedicated to affordable housing
 - A lack of commitment to affordable housing from elected leaders
- The **top three solutions** desired to meet the housing needs of community members were:
 - Dedicated funding for affordable housing
 - Increased resident advocacy for affordable housing
 - Willingness to support alternative housing solutions (i.e. tiny homes and ADUs)

Regional differences in priorities:

District 1 (West County – Supervisor John Gioia):

- **Affordable housing** for low-income residents and stronger **tenant protections** were the most frequently mentioned urgent housing needs, while a **lack of funding** dedicated to affordable housing was listed at the top barrier.
- Participants wanted to see more **resident advocacy** in support of affordable housing and more **funding** for affordable housing, such as through a countywide housing bond.

District 2 (South County – Supervisor Candace Andersen):

- Participants want to see more **affordable housing** for seniors and other low-income residents and more housing **development near transit**.

- Key barriers included **classism** and a **lack of public education** on the root causes of homelessness and housing instability.
- Participants would like to see increased **resident advocacy** in support of affordable housing in their communities.

District 3 (Far East County – Supervisor Diane Burgis):

- The most pressing housing need mentioned was **long-term housing with services**.
- Barriers included a **lack of public education** on the root causes of homelessness and housing instability, **insufficient funding** dedicated to affordable housing, and **NIMBYism**.
- Participants would like to see an increase in **funding dedicated** to affordable housing and more funding for **homeless services**.

District 4 (Central County – Supervisor Karen Mitchoff):

- Top housing needs included **preventing displacement** of low-income communities and communities of color, **more affordable housing** for all income levels, and **tenant protections**.
- **NIMBYism** was the top barrier mentioned; other barriers frequently mentioned included a **lack of commitment** from elected leaders and a **lack of dedicated funding** for affordable housing.
- The top solution was **dedicated funding** for affordable housing.

District 5 (North County – Supervisor Federal Glover):

- The most urgent need was **long-term housing with services**.
- **NIMBYism** was the most frequently mentioned barrier.
- Suggested solutions included a **dedicated funding** source for affordable housing, such as a countywide housing bond, and **resident advocacy** in support of affordable housing.